

THE OFFICE ACTION

In the Office Action issued on July 5, 2006, the Examiner presented a number of objections/rejections.

The Examiner objected to claims 5 and 10 as allegedly mixing statutory subject matter.

The Examiner rejected claims 5, 9 and 10 as reciting elements allegedly lacking antecedent basis.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Zuyev et al, Optimizing injection Gate Location and Cycle Time for the In-Mold Coating, ANTEC 2001 ("Zuyev").

The Examiner rejected claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zuyev in view of Chen et al., In-Mold Functional Coating of Thermoplastic Substrates: Process Modeling, ANTEC 2001 ("Chen").

REMARKS

Amendments have been made to claim 9 to address the Examiner's rejection. Claims 1-10 remain pending in the application.

A. The Examiner's Objections

With regard to the objection to claims 5 and 10, Applicants are somewhat confused. The Examiner objected to these claims as allegedly mixing statutory subject matter by claiming a program product in a method claim.

Applicants respectfully disagree. In claims 5 and 10, Applicants are not claiming a program product as the Examiner submits. Applicants are not claiming a "program product". Rather, Applicants are merely reciting that are merely limiting the parent claim by reciting that instructions for carrying out the process of the parent claim are contained on a computer readable medium. There is no product being claimed here, but merely further defining that instructions for the carrying out of the process can be contained on a computer readable medium source. Such a claim is well within the rights of the Applicants, and does not run afoul of any patent law. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

B. The §112 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 5 and 10 as having insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "wherein instructions for carrying out said method". Again, Applicants are confused by the rejection. Specifically, "instructions for carrying out said method" is a new element defined within claims 5 and 10 specifically. Applicants have not claimed "said instructions" or otherwise defined a limitation already defined. Rather, "instructions" are a new element, recited within the claims, which need no antecedent basis. That is, no antecedent basis is required for the introduction of a new element. Applicants are confused by this rejection and request the Examiner to provide further instructions or withdraw this rejection as improper.

With regard to the rejection of claim 9 on the same basis, an amendment has been made to claim 9 to replace the word "the" with the word "a". Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

C. The Claims are not Anticipated or Rendered Obvious by the Cited References

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6 and 10 under §102 based on Zuyev. Applicants respectfully disagree. Zuyev discloses a process for optimizing cycle time by minimizing cure time by either increasing the mold wall temperature or by adding more catalyst (page 1, col 1, paragraph 1). Zuyev completely fails to disclose a process including a step of fitting results obtained from a theoretical kinetic model to a metamodel of the cure time as a function of an initiator level and reaction temperature. That is, Zuyev fails to disclose or suggest such a process wherein the initiator levels AND the reaction temperature are used to obtain a kinetic model. Zuyev does disclose adding more catalyst, but the Examiner will appreciate that a catalyst is completely different from an initiator in a reaction. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

With regard to the Examiner's rejection of claims 7-9 based on Zuyev in conjunction with Chen, even assuming that Chen discloses the step of predicting a coating fill pattern in the mold by determining the relation between a pressure in the mold and a flow rate in the coating and even assuming the propriety of combining the two references, such a combination would still not disclose or suggest all the limitations of the base claim. That is, such a combination would not disclose or suggest a process including a step of fitting results obtained from a theoretical kinetic model to a metamodel of the cure time as a function of an initiator level and reaction

temperature. Thus, such a combination fails to render the present claims obvious. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the subject application is now in better condition for examination.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

Nov 6, 2006

Date

Joseph E. Waters
Joseph E. Waters, Reg. No. 50,427
1100 Superior Avenue, Seventh Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582